



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/775,441	02/10/2004	Rama Divakaruni	FIS920000337US3 (14114Z)	9423
23389	7590	07/21/2006	EXAMINER	
SCULLY SCOTT MURPHY & PRESSER, PC 400 GARDEN CITY PLAZA SUITE 300 GARDEN CITY, NY 11530			LOKE, STEVEN HO YIN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2811	

DATE MAILED: 07/21/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/775,441	DIVAKARUNI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Steven Loke	2811	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 May 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2811

1. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1, lines 7-9, the phrase "a collar oxide region formed one or more remaining portions of each deep trench" is unclear as to how a collar oxide region formed the deep trench. It is believed that the phrase should rewrite as "a collar oxide region formed on one or more remaining portions of each deep trench".

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gruening et al. (U.S. patent no. 6,437,381 in the IDS filed on 2/10/04)

The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

In regards to claim 1, Gruening et al. show all the elements of the claimed invention in fig. 15. It is a memory cell in a DRAM (col. 9, lines 3-22), comprising: a deep trench region [200] having a vertical MOSFET (the MOSFET is located in the top portion of the trench which includes a gate oxide [160], source and drain regions [18, 62], and a gate electrode (not shown in the figure, but it is disclosed in the prior art (element [48] in fig. 12, see also col. 7, lines 31-32)) and an underlying capacitor [34-36] formed therein that are in electrical contact to each other through at least one buried-strap out diffusion region [62] which is present within a portion of a wall of the deep trench; the memory cell having a deep trench conductor [36] forming an electrode of the underlying capacitor and a collar oxide region [130] formed on one or more remaining portions of the deep trench not containing the buried-strap out diffusion region [62] for electrically isolating a body region [50] from said underlying capacitor [34-36]; and a trench top oxide (TTO) (a portion of layer [160]) located completely inside the deep trench for isolating the deep trench conductor [36] and the buried-strap out diffusion [62] from a gate conductor region (the gate electrode that formed on the top of the gate oxide [160]); an underlying nitride layer (a bottom portion of layer [1250]) formed immediately adjacent to and contacting a top of a sacrificial oxide layer [14] formed immediately adjacent to and contacting a top of said deep trench conductor [36] between the top of the deep trench conductor [36] and the buried-strap out diffusion region [62] and underlying the trench top oxide (TTO) layer.

It is inherent that the underlying nitride layer and the sacrificial oxide are used to eliminate a possibility of the trench top oxide layer dielectric breakdown between the

Art Unit: 2811

gate conductor region and the electrode [36] of the underlying capacitor because they provide further insulation between the gate conductor and the electrode of the underlying capacitor.

Since Gruening et al. disclose their invention relates to vertical transistor structures in the trench capacitors of DRAM (col. 1, lines 7-10), a plurality of memory cells each having a structure of fig. 15 would be formed in the semiconductor substrate. It is inherent that the memory cells of Gruening et al. are formed in a DRAM cell array which are arranged in rows and columns because it is well known in the art that memory cells in a DRAM cell array are arranged in rows and columns.

In regards to claim 2, Gruening et al. further disclose the nitride layer [1250] is deposited to a thickness of 1.0 nm (col. 10, lines 17-20).

In regards to claim 3, Gruening et al. further disclose each said vertical MOSFET includes a gate dielectric (a sidewall portion of layer [160] and a sidewall portion of layer [1250]) formed on an inner surface of a sidewall of each said deep trench [200]. Since Gruening et al. disclose their invention relates to vertical transistor structures in the trench capacitors of DRAM (col. 1, lines 7-10), a plurality of memory cells each having a transistor structure of fig. 15 are formed in the semiconductor substrate.

In regards to claim 4, Gruening et al. further disclose the underlying nitride layer [1250] is formed only under and on the side of the trench top oxide layer.

4. Applicant's arguments filed 5/9/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

It is urged, in page 5 of the remarks, that Gruening only discloses a gate oxide layer 160 that extends outside of the trench 200 and is not completely located inside the trench 200 (see Gruening, Figure 15). However, a trench top oxide layer (a portion of layer [160]) of Gruening is completely located inside the trench [200] (fig. 15). Therefore, Gruening is still read on claims 1-4.

2. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven Loke whose telephone number is (571) 272-1657. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eddie Lee can be reached on (571) 272-1732. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

sl
July 18, 2006

Steven Loke
Primary Examiner
